

Public Comments Received on the Draft 2025 TIP and MTC Responses

Name	Organization	Source
Ignacio Dayrit	Public	Webform submission

Comment:

No more freeway widening please.
 I-80 from SF to Sacto already feels like 101 between SF and SJ.
 And work with your sister government agencies - especially CalEPA - to streamline infill.
 We will never reduce GHG if we keep facilitating and surrendering to sprawl.
 Thank you.

Response:

The projects in the TIP come from the projects identified by the region's long-range plan (Plan Bay Area 2050: <https://planbayarea.org/finalplan2050>). Around two-thirds of the transportation funding in Plan Bay Area 2050 is earmarked for restoring, operating and maintaining the existing system, in line with MTC's long-held pledge to "Fix It First." Plan Bay Area 2050 also has a focus on making better use of the existing freeway network through projects like a regional express lane network and an express bus network. However, Plan Bay Area 2050 does include a limited selection of freeway widening projects at key bottlenecks to achieve short- to medium term congestion relief. Some of those projects can be found in the 2025 TIP.

Name	Organization	Source
Elliott Pickett	Public	Webform submission

Comment:

Less money should be granted to projects involving roadway expansion, even if it is for HOV lanes.

More money should be spent on bike facilities, especially if it involves shrinking size of existing auto lanes to accommodate better bike facilities.

More money should be available to support transit headway reduction programs.

Response:

The projects in the TIP come from the projects identified by the region's long-range plan (Plan Bay Area 2050: <https://planbayarea.org/finalplan2050>). Around two-thirds of the transportation funding in Plan Bay Area 2050 is earmarked for restoring, operating and maintaining the existing system, in line with MTC's long-held pledge to "Fix It First." Plan Bay Area 2050 also has a focus on making better use of the existing freeway network through projects like a regional express lane network and an express bus network. However, Plan Bay Area 2050 does include a limited selection of freeway widening projects at key bottlenecks to achieve short- to medium term congestion relief. Some of those projects can be found in the 2025 TIP. Plan Bay Area 2050 has a longer-term vision of strengthening the transit network and swaying individual behavior away from single-occupancy driving.

Public Comments Received on the Draft 2025 TIP and MTC Responses

Name	Organization	Source
Wayne Phillips	Public	Webform submission

Comment:

----- another year goes by and nobody says anything about motorcycles and scooters . . . space-saving, road wear-saving, don't contribute to traffic jams .
Big

Response:

While motorcycles and scooters are not called out explicitly in the TIP, all roadway projects ultimately support these modes of transportation as motorcycles can use the same infrastructure as cars.

Name	Organization	Source
Daniel Bell	Public	Webform submission

Comment:

Seamless connections between Bay Area rail services are decades away. In the meantime, exclusive/dedicated/safe shuttle bus connection routes are needed to promote patronage. Examples of connections: 1) Amtrak Bus from SFTC 3rd Floor Bus Deck to Emeryville Amtrak Station, 2) CalTrain Bus from 4th/King Station to SFTC, Ferry Building, Embarcadero BART/MUNI, 3) BART Bus from Oakland West BART Station to Emeryville Amtrak Station.

Response:

Seamless transit service is a priority of MTC. MTC's Regional Mapping and Wayfinding Project (<https://mtc.ca.gov/operations/transit-regional-network-management/regional-mapping-wayfinding>) aims to make it easier for travelers to navigate and explore the Bay Area using public transit and connecting services. MTC also adopted a Bay Area Transit Transformation Action Plan (<https://mtc.ca.gov/TransitActionPlan>) in July 2021 to identify actions needed to reshape the region's transit system into a more connected, more efficient, and more user-focused mobility network across the entire Bay Area and beyond. Staff at MTC are now working on executing the Action Plan. MTC is now working closely with the region's transit operators to update the Transit Transformation Action Plan through Transit 2050+ (<https://planbayarea.org/2050/transit-2050-plus>) — a parallel long-range planning effort to Plan Bay Area 2050+ that will develop a first-of-its-kind plan to re-envision the future of the public transit network in the nine-county Bay Area.

Public Comments Received on the Draft 2025 TIP and MTC Responses

Name	Organization	Source
Jose Caballero	Public	Webform submission

Comment:

Vallejo needs to more inclusion. The current layout is a good start but lacks. A new study shows that Vallejo has true worst commute in the country. This will not get better over time. It is inequitable to not bolster up the plan and more heavily include Vallejo as it is a hub for the workforce of the Bay Area and more importantly the population served by MTC.

https://www.kron4.com/news/bay-area/two-north-bay-cities-have-worst-commute-in-us-study/?utm_source=facebook.com&utm_medium=referral&utm_campaign=socialflow&fbclid=IwZXh0bgNhZW0CMTEAAR1xh828VuczbyufqydtPaL956p8B2s4_R1t0qUWa-LhxHdOwatYlnYYIJk_aem_I2TWSkwxbAEjavq9s6Egcg

Response:

The 2025 TIP only includes projects that have committed funding within the next four years (2025-2028). However, Plan Bay Area 2050 (<https://planbayarea.org/finalplan2050>) is a long-range plan with projects identified for the next 30 years. Plan Bay Area 2050 envisions a well-connected, safe and multimodal regional transportation network. MTC is also working closely with the region's transit operators on Transit 2050+ (<https://planbayarea.org/2050/transit-2050-plus>) — a parallel long-range planning effort to Plan Bay Area 2050+ that will develop a first-of-its-kind plan to re-envision the future of the public transit network in the nine-county Bay Area. Transit 2050+ is re-imagining a Bay Area public transit system that is service-based, hub-oriented and fiscally responsible.

Name	Organization	Source
Gama Sigala	Public	Webform submission

Comment:

Vallejo needs to be better connected. The current layout is ok but poorly services our area. A recent study shows Vallejo having one of the worst commutes in the country. We must do better and provide sound, equitable connections. Vallejo has been underserved for far too long.

Response:

Please see the answer to the prior comment.

Public Comments Received on the Draft 2025 TIP and MTC Responses

Name	Organization	Source
Bill Mayben	Public	Email

Comment:

Subject: TIP Implications of Sea Level Rise on proposed sea walls.

Dear Bay Area Metro staff;

The UN IPCC projects 2 scenarios for West Coast Sea Level Rise in the year 2100. There are indications, given what will be at stake, that we should use the conservative estimate of six feet.

Based on PBA 2050; these seawalls will essentially protect all relevant existing improvements and subsequent improvements from now until then.

PBA 2050 calls for 2' of sea level rise.

Increases in sea wall height require fundamental engineering differences from the footings up. It would probably reduce costs and disruption to build to the 2100 projection to start with. Amidst ambiguity regarding sea level rise, this would provide a margin of safety.

Building lower walls may leave future residents with difficult, expensive and time-consuming alternatives, somewhere between 2050 and 2100; and expose all TIP and other improvements to, at least, the disrupting future work.

If TIP improvements are expected to contribute well beyond 2050; so should the infrastructure they depend on.

Response:

MTC has undertaken a number of efforts to address the resilience of the Bay Area's transportation infrastructure. Within the Environment Element of Plan Bay Area 2050 there are a set of strategies to "Reduce Risk from Hazards" which includes strategy EN1 Adapt to Sea Level Rise.

MTC is currently working on a limited update to Plan Bay Area 2050, called Plan Bay Area 2050+. As part of this effort, staff have integrated new data and information on local sea level rise adaptation projects and plan to include a new component called the Sea Level Rise Resilience Project List, which will identify projects that adapt the nine-county Bay Area shoreline to sea level rise in the decades ahead. Both of these efforts have used the Ocean Protection Council's guidance on sea level rise forecasts and considers sea levels beyond the year 2050. For more information:

https://planbayarea.org/sites/default/files/documents/Plan_Bay_Area_2050%2B_ProjectLists.pdf

Other efforts to address the resilience of the Bay Area's transportation infrastructure include partnering with the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) through their Adapting to Rising Tides (ART) Program (<https://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/plans-projects/climate-change-clean-vehicles/adapting-rising-tides>) and their Bay Adapt initiative: <https://www.bayadapt.org/>

Public Comments Received on the Draft 2025 TIP and MTC Responses

Name	Organization	Source
Bill Mayben	Public	Email

Comment:

•While TIP 2025-2028 may be congruent with PBA 2050; is PBA 2050 itself still congruent with exponential climate change? We cannot automatically assume that our incremental approach to Sea Level Rise planning meets the acceleration of climate change in an exponential environment. If the precepts in PBA2050 no longer meet climatologists current forecasts, TIP improvements may be placed at risk, or fail to perform, prior to their projected lifespan.

•As PBA 2050 was in development, Sea Level rise at San Francisco Bay was projected to be 2' by 2050. Now, climatologists state "two feet; but it could be six feet." Two feet with King Tides and storm surge equals four feet. Six feet with King Tides and storm surge can equal eight feet. Climatologists also have found that our oceans have been up to 160' higher than they are now. Extraordinary sea melt processes have been discovered in motion in Antarctica and Greenland.

•Why are these considerations important? First, in Extreme Climate Events, public transit may be our foundational fallback; and should be designed accordingly. Secondly, Extreme Climate Events are anticipated to become both stronger and more frequent over time. This means that in our future, the demands for urgent mitigation of, and adaptation to, the effects of these events will be greater, and both the atmosphere and financial capabilities within which they need to be accomplished will be less accommodating. This means repairs and reconstruction will be more expensive and time consuming; falling against a backdrop of many urgently needed projects, which accentuates the importance of the location, materials, projected lifespan, and built-in assumptions of mitigation and adaptation elements to extend their utility value over time.

•I am of the opinion that the boundaries of cities, counties and green space reserves; established as fixed and sacrosanct by PBA 2050; have constrained a growing Bay Area population into few choices. Sea walls are a prime result; forever changing the character of the Bay for all time; and creating as many problems over time as they solve. Not to mention the ongoing costs to raise them. How high will they need to be, ultimately? We could have considered a more aggressive decentralization policy; or hilltop/ridgetop development policy for the long haul. Sea level rise is relentless. An orderly retreat over time is less expensive. We have the rest of the areas of 9 counties surrounding the Bay.

•NOAA provides a "Sea Level Viewer", allowing anyone to test the effects of various projected sea level rise on coastal communities. If applied realistically, and updated frequently, this can change many of our development assumptions. It is a moving target.

•Based on our current advances in severe climate events; the Bay Area can expect heat waves, droughts, and heavy rain inundation; among others. Whatever sea walls are planned, they must include pumping facilities to relieve protected lands from flooding behind the walls; including the addition of water levels anticipating flooding rivers and streams entering the Bay.

•It is unlikely that transportation improvements will be more affordable, nor will the environment be more accommodating, than today. We should act accordingly; this is not business as usual.

Public Comments Received on the Draft 2025 TIP and MTC Responses

(continued) •TIP improvements as described, given our history, should last well beyond 2050. BART service began September 11, 1972; 53 years ago; after extended design and construction. We continue to add to the original core facilities. Projecting TIP 2025 forward, what likely conditions will they face? In the SF Bay Area, the effects of climate change will ultimately drive our decision-making.

•Do the TIP projected improvements reduce dependence on single family automobiles; or discourage an auto-centric economy?

•Would reducing commute traffic enhance our transition to sustainability? What elements could we hold out to the world as models of breakthrough technology or strategies? Should CA consider investing in the domestic design and production of Neighborhood Electric Vehicles to reduce use of full size cars and trucks?

•Are our transportation goals and our climate mitigation and adaptation goals internally consistent? Do TIP improvements carry core elements of resilience to climate change?

•Each public dollar should be spent with the certitude that it is buying the most necessary, enduring and uninterrupted solution.

Response:

MTC has undertaken a number of efforts to address the resilience of the Bay Area's transportation infrastructure. Within the Environment Element of Plan Bay Area 2050 there are a set of strategies to "Reduce Risk from Hazards" which includes strategy EN1 Adapt to Sea Level Rise.

MTC is currently working on a limited update to Plan Bay Area 2050, called Plan Bay Area 2050+. As part of this effort, staff have integrated new data and information on local sea level rise adaptation projects and plan to include a new component called the Sea Level Rise Resilience Project List, which will identify projects that adapt the nine-county Bay Area shoreline to sea level rise in the decades ahead. Both of these efforts have used the Ocean Protection Council's guidance on sea level rise forecasts and considers sea levels beyond the year 2050. For more information:

https://planbayarea.org/sites/default/files/documents/Plan_Bay_Area_2050%2B_ProjectLists.pdf

Other efforts to address the resilience of the Bay Area's transportation infrastructure include partnering with the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) through their Adapting to Rising Tides (ART) Program (<https://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/plans-projects/climate-change-clean-vehicles/adapting-rising-tides>) and their Bay Adapt initiative: <https://www.bayadapt.org/>

Per federal requirements, the 2025 TIP is consistent with Plan Bay Area 2050. This means that all projects in the TIP are align with Plan Bay Area 2050's resiliency and sustainability goals and strategies.

Public Comments Received on the Draft 2025 TIP and MTC Responses

Name	Organization	Source
Amy McNeely	Oakland Public Library	Webform submission

Comment:

I am not in favor of the San Pablo Avenue Bus/Bike lanes. I feel like we were told this plan would be happening, not asked if we thought it should. My branch, the Golden Gate Branch, will lose its bus stop. How will patrons and workers get to my library? The nearest bus stop will be .25 miles away. That's too far for seniors to walk. We will also lose all of our street parking. Our 8 spots will not be enough for the community. We already get people who stay in the lot all day who do not patronize the library. People come from all over Oakland, and as far as Richmond because this library has a valuable resource: free, easy, plentiful parking. That's one of the joys of this neighborhood. I'm told it's too hard to change the traffic flow on San Pablo by adding lights or stop signs. It seems to me this is far more drastic than adding more lights. San Pablo is already stop and go every evening, so I don't see how slowing it down will make it safer. Why aren't we looking at making Market a bike-safer street? Who will monitor parking in the neighborhood? I've never seen a traffic officer here. Will Oakland hire them? I also think MLK, Market, and Adeline will become much less safe. Most of the neighbors seem against it. Thank you.

Response:

While the San Pablo Avenue Bus/Bike Lanes project is in the 2025 TIP for funding purposes, MTC is not the project sponsor. Comments on specific projects such as this one should be directed to the appropriate agency. The San Pablo Avenue Bus/Bike Lanes project is being implemented by the Alameda County Transportation Commission. We have forwarded this comment to ACTC on your behalf, but you can share any additional input on the project via the project website: <https://www.alamedactc.org/programs-projects/multimodal-arterial-roads/sanpabloave>

Name	Organization	Source
Michael Sullivan	Public	Webform submission

Comment:

Looking at the fact sheet, I focused on the graph which illustrates the percent of funding and projects. What's noteworthy is the low cost for walk/bike projects compared to the others. I don't know yet what's planned for roads/state highways, but expansion should be out of the question. We'd be better off committing more funding to walk/bike projects since they are cost effective. Or take some of the funding for roads/highways and apply it to mass transit. The miles of streets, roads, highways and "stroads" is unsustainable. We must focus on making others means of getting from point A to B just as viable as getting into a car.

Response:

The vision for transportation in the Bay Area, as written in Plan Bay Area 2050, is to 1) maintain and optimize the existing transportation system; 2) create healthy and safe streets; 3) build a next-generation transit network. Around two-thirds of the transportation funding in Plan Bay Area 2050 is earmarked for restoring, operating and maintaining the existing system, in line with MTC's long-held pledge to "Fix It First." You can learn more about MTC's strategies for achieving these goals at: <https://planbayarea.org/finalplan2050>

Public Comments Received on the Draft 2025 TIP and MTC Responses

Name	Organization	Source
Wayne Phillips	Public	Webform submission

Comment:

----- motorcycles / scooters solve ALL of the bay area's (and elsewhere, too) problems: low oil/gas usage / parking / road wear / jams , and they do that with only a 20% usage rate which happens to match the bay area's ownership of powered two-wheeled vehicles . . .

Response:

While motorcycles and scooters are not called out explicitly in the TIP, all roadway projects ultimately support these modes of transportation as motorcycles can use the same infrastructure as cars.

Name	Organization	Source
Howard Strassner	Public	Webform submission

Comment:

Operating funds for transit are a prime need. Capital for maintenance of transit facilities and roadways is second. This may not leave any funding for highways expansion. Instead of new lane pay for HOT lanes is better. This will provide funds for transit.

Response:

Compared to Plan Bay Area 2050, which plans for the transportation needs of the region over the next 30 years, the TIP is a short-term funding document which is heavily weighted towards large capital projects. While Plan Bay Area 2050 funds all of the region's transit operating needs, much of this funding comes from state, regional and local sources that are not typically included in the TIP. Additionally, around two-thirds of the transportation funding in Plan Bay Area 2050 is earmarked for restoring, operating and maintaining the existing system, in line with MTC's long-held pledge to "Fix It First."

Name	Organization	Source
Jackson Hurst	Public	Webform submission

Comment:

I have reviewed MTC's Draft 2025 TIP Document and I approve and support the findings in the document.

Response:

Comment received and appreciated.

Name	Organization	Source
Milo Trauss	Public	Webform submission

Comment:

Implement a VMT tax first on robotaxis and then on all private vehicles to help solve for congestion and public transportation financing. please see this article for reference https://open.substack.com/pub/matthewyglesias/p/robotaxis-should-be-a-wakeup-call?r=t4j7&utm_campaign=post&utm_medium=email

Long term planning should prioritize mass transit and de-prioritize private motor vehicles

Public Comments Received on the Draft 2025 TIP and MTC Responses

Response:

Plan Bay Area 2050 proposes implementing road pricing within the Bay Area to reduce traffic congestion and greenhouse gas emissions by de-incentivizing auto use, particularly during periods of peak demand and by single or zero occupant vehicles, while simultaneously generating new revenues for reinvestment in sustainable alternatives to driving. The plan proposes implementing per-mile tolling on select congested freeways where parallel transit options exist to curb traffic congestion and climate emissions through 2050 and beyond, while generating new revenues for reinvestment in sustainable alternatives to driving. This strategy, applied on a limited number of freeway corridors throughout the region, would charge drivers a toll based on the number of miles driven, the number of passengers, and the time of day, with lower tolls charged to carpoolers and those traveling outside rush-hour periods. Low-income drivers would also be charged a discounted rate. This strategy is being further refined as part of the ongoing Next Generation Freeways Study as well as the next ongoing iteration of the regional long-range plan, Plan Bay Area 2050+. You can read more at <https://planbayarea.org/finalplan2050>.

Name	Organization	Source
Sara Rowley	San Antonio Station Alliance	Webform submission

Comment:

I represent the San Antonio Station Alliance (SASA), a grassroots organization in East Oakland that is advocating for a BART/regional rail infill station in the San Antonio neighborhood. I am writing to comment on a key gap in the Transit 2050+ draft plan. Currently we see a multitude of proposals that go far in the way of serving the transportation needs of the greater Bay Area, but we see a gap in these plans that serve crucial communities in the East Bay, specifically East Oakland.

We strongly support an infill station that would do as your mission strategy T11 promises to do: "serve new markets or currently underserved markets."

We, the residents of East Oakland, stand as a stark example of a persistently underserved community. We represent local businesses, community-based organizations, and individuals who live and work in East Oakland, who support an infill station in our neighborhood.

San Antonio station would play a critical role in serving a historically under-served community— one that is population-dense, public transit dependent, diverse, and ready to thrive. Prioritizing our communities with infill station development is an investment in future generations: in the thriving neighborhoods they grow up in, the green spaces they interact with, in homes that offer transit access to all the Bay Area has to offer.

Please consider us when you are looking to build our future for 2050. Our campaign has just begun, but we will be keeping a watchful eye on the greater planning efforts of your commission, who gets prioritized, and why.

Projects like the San Antonio BART infill station are critical towards bridging the equity gap in the Bay Area transit system. We urge you to prioritize its development and demonstrate a genuine commitment to serving all Bay Area residents, regardless of race, income, or zip code.

Public Comments Received on the Draft 2025 TIP and MTC Responses

Response:

MTC is currently working closely with the region's transit operators on Transit 2050+ (<https://planbayarea.org/2050/transit-2050-plus>) — a parallel long-range planning effort to Plan Bay Area 2050+ that will develop a first-of-its-kind plan to re-envision the future of the public transit network in the nine-county Bay Area. Transit 2050+ is responsible for updating these transit strategies with the goal of creating a comprehensive regional transit network concept. When finalized, this Transit 2050+ network concept will be incorporated into the Plan Bay Area 2050+ Final Blueprint in late 2024. We have forwarded this comment to the Transit 2050+ team on your behalf, but you can share any additional input on the project via the project website: <https://planbayarea.org/2050/transit-2050/draft-transit-2050-network>

The 2025 TIP only includes projects that have committed funding within the next four years (2025-2028). In order for projects to be incorporated into a future TIP, they must be in a regional long-range plan such as Plan Bay Area 2050+. Projects are incorporated into the long-range plan through collaboration with MTC and local agencies. As the decision to implement an infill BART station likely will begin with the BART board and staff, we recommend reaching out to them to discuss this proposal.

Name	Organization	Source
Dylan Finch	Public	Webform submission

Comment:

I'm glad to see the large focus on public transit investment. I strongly support frequent, reliable, and well integrated public transit. I drive but I would like to have the option to take public transit when roads are congested or if I just don't feel like driving.

Response:

Comment received and appreciated.

Public Comments Received on the Draft 2025 TIP and MTC Responses

Name	Organization	Source
Bruce De Benedictis	Public	Email

Comment:

I wanted to make sure comment at <https://mtc.ca.gov/funding/transportation-improvement-program-tip>, but there is no obvious link on that page for making comments. Frankly, it seems the page is more oriented to those who have time and money to sift through all the information there, and that tends to mean paid lobbyists.

My belief is that funding for local streets is vastly underrepresented, and unequally allotted. This is evident on my own street, which is about half a mile long, but stretches through two cities. We in Oakland are paying extra taxes to pay for street repairs, while the portion of the street which is in Piedmont gets repaved far more often. THERE IS NOT ONE SINGLE VEHICLE IN PIEDMONT THAT HAS NOT USED OAKLAND STREETS, while there are plenty of people in Oakland who never go through Piedmont. The same is true of Alameda. There is no equity in that. Oakland residents have to bear not only the cost of the maintenance of the physical streets that people from these other cities use, they must also provide services like police and other emergency services. Of course, cities with limited-access roads (freeways) must provide services for people who do not pay taxes for them. There was a time when a mayor of Emeryville told me that their biggest expense was for their fire department, which was used most of the time to put out vehicle fires on I-80.

There are more and more people who cannot afford both a car and a place to live. There are a number of reasons for that which are related to transportation policy. If the choice is between living in a home and living in a car, and there are not alternative methods of getting to work, school, shopping, as well as other necessities, one will live in a car. Once someone moves into a car, if it breaks down, that person is on the street. We need universal transportation alternatives, not just transit ghettos where those who rely on transit are isolated. Those people are restricted to jobs that they can get to, but have to compete for them with people who have other alternatives.

The competition for jobs enables employers to pay less than the actual cost of the employee. This leads to lower wages, resulting in lower revenue from taxes as well as the constriction of money in circulation. It also allows employers to discriminate by providing a bigger pool of prospective employees. As it is, the taxes are not enough to provide adequate funding for the police and emergency services as it is, and those services are not funded by vehicle drivers to the extent that they use them. If you leave a car on the street and it gets stolen, the police will respond. They are not likely to respond for anything else left on the street, let alone a home that someone tries to steal by squatting, a house that pays the majority of the taxes to pay for police.

(continued) There are probably a few good improvements in your plans. But I think that it is likely that they are heavily outweighed by a ruinous legacy of programs and projects that were enacted by those just out for themselves. It would help if we could get plain and simple comparisons of the costs and benefits of what we are doing. For instance, is the cost of new fare gates at BART likely to save more money than the cost of something to enforce HOV rules, as I see a lot more cars using the bus lanes at the Bay Bridge during the off hours than I see people not paying at BART. And there is no doubt that the cost of uninsured and underinsured insurance that drivers pay far outweighs the cost of fare evasion on all forms of mass transit.

Bruce De Benedictis
Oakland, California

Public Comments Received on the Draft 2025 TIP and MTC Responses

Response:

Plan Bay Area 2050, which is the region's long-range plan that influences many of the transportation improvements found in the 2025 TIP, aims to connect the elements of housing, the economy, transportation and the environment through 35 strategies to make the Bay Area more equitable for all residents and more resilient in the face of unexpected challenges. Many of the strategies in the Plan address aspects of this comment. For example, the Plan prioritizes maintaining existing transportation infrastructure, such as local roads, with a framework of "Fix it First." The Plan also has multiple economic strategies, including implementing a statewide universal basic income, providing incentives to employers to shift jobs closer to housing-rich areas well served by transit, and allowing more commercial density in select areas near public transportation.

MTC has also implemented a Transit Oriented Communities policy (<https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/land-use/transit-oriented-communities-toc-policy>), which aims to support housing density in areas served by transit to address the issues raised about people needing additional modes of transportation without a car.

Name	Organization	Source
Aleta Dupree	Public	Verbal comment at 7/24 Commission Meeting

Comment:

Lots of interesting things in here that I think are really going to help our community. SFMTA Train Control is very important. I use that, there have been issues with train control in the past. And the Powell Street Traction Power substation for BART. I'm hoping for a day on BART when we're going to be running 30 trains per hour in each direction through that tunnel and we need that infrastructure to support that level of service. There's a lot of diverse work in here. Freight corridor work. Freight is important, we can't forget about freight. I'm dependent on things I get in stores and things I order online, trucks and trains are a big part of that. There's some mention of zero emission, county connection and solar in tri valley. Harbor Bay Ferry zero emission work. These are all definitely things I support and sync with my values. I did see something in the heading about the Portal, the Portal is very important. I think that the Portal is necessary for us to go forward. It's a big signature project but it's important. We finished Grand Central Madison in NYC, now LIRR service is up by 40%. I think the Portal can help us build a more connected community. Thank you.

Response:

Sponsors of the projects referenced in the comment are currently seeking discretionary grant funding through the State's SCCP, TCEP, and TIRCP programs. MTC will consider project endorsements for those programs at September 2024 committee and Commission meetings. Projects awarded state discretionary grant funds will be incorporated into the 2025 TIP through future revisions.